



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,248	04/22/2005	Jingyuan Yu	SHA 133NP	9068
23995	7590	07/25/2007		
RABIN & Berdo, PC 1101 14TH STREET, NW SUITE 500 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER KWIECINSKI, RYAN D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3635	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/532,248	YU, JINGYUAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ryan D. Kwiecinski	3635	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/15/2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 3, line 15, brief description of Figure 3 appears to be incorrect.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-4 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1, line 7, the recitation "the sticking profile" is vague, indefinite, and confusing as lacking antecedent basis.

Claim 2, line 2, the recitation "same wood" is vague. The office suggests the replacement of --the same type of wood--.

Claim 3, line 1, "sticking profile" should be --a sticking profile--or --sticking profiles--.

Claim 3, line 3, the recitation "the surface" is vague, indefinite, and confusing as lacking antecedent basis.

Claim 3, line 4, the recitation "the irregular surface" is vague, indefinite, and confusing as lacking antecedent basis.

Claim 4, line 2, the recitation "different wood" is vague. The office suggests the replacement of --different types of wood--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims 1-2 and 3 are vague, indefinite, and confusing because it is unclear which material the stickings of the door are made from. Applicant cannot replace a part of the product as recited in claim 1. Applicant replaces the "high quality wood used in the stickings" with "ordinary wood or artificial boards". Applicant must disclose whether the claimed door has the high quality wood stickings or the stickings made from ordinary wood. Applicant should use the disclosure of the application in order to express what the applicant has replaced in the prior art and should recite the product of the application in the claims.

Also the claim never recites that the stickings are actually made from high quality wood, but instead recites "the high quality wood of the stickings".

Regarding claim 1, the phrase "mainly" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,540,026 to Gartland.

Claim 1:

Gartland discloses a kind of veneered wooden doors, mainly comprises stiles (12, Fig.6) and rails (54,56, Fig.6) and core panels (14, Fig.6), wherein the stiles and rails comprise stile rail cores (stiles, Column 12, lines 23-32) and rails, Column 12, lines 41-42, Column 10, lines 22-24), edge bands (34, Fig.6) and stickings (part of the stiles and rails), wherein the stile rail cores (Column 12, lines 41-42, Column 10, lines 22-24) are made of wood of ordinary trees or artificial boards, the edge bands are made of high quality wood (Column 12, lines 54-55; See Column 12, lines 32-33; See Column 13, lines 49-51), the core panels (Column 12, lines 23-27) are made of wood of ordinary trees or artificial boards, and the outer part of the core panels are veneered with high quality veneers (Column 12, lines 32-33), characterized that the high quality wood used in the stickings is replaced with ordinary wood or artificial boards (sticking is one

Art Unit: 3635

piece with the stiles and rails therefore it is made from the chipboard or low cost timber as stated above), and the sticking profile is veneered with wood veneers containing high quality wood grains (the stickings are one-piece with the stiles and rails, therefore they are veneered with a high quality veneer as stated above).

Claim 2:

The veneered wooden doors as described in Claim 1, wherein the stickings and the stile rail cores are made of same wood or artificial boards, and are made as a whole (the stickings and the rails cores are made as one out of chipboard or low cost timber, See claim 1).

Claim 3:

A method for veneering sticking profile of a wooden door, comprising the steps of: applying resin glue on one side of a high-grade wood veneer, pasting it on the surface of the stickings of the wooden door; then putting the wooden door into a tamping machine having the same shape as the irregular surface of the sticking profile, with the temperature adjusted to 60-120°C, and the pressure to 5-15kg/cm, applying the pressure for 2-3 minutes (Columns 9-10, lines 64-67 and 1-38, respectively).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,540,026 to Gartland in view of US 4,716,700 to Hagemeyer.

Claim 4:

Gartland discloses the veneered wood doors as described in claim 1, but does not disclose the stickings and the stile rail cores are made of different wood or artificial board.

Hagemeyer discloses the stickings and the stile rail cores are made of different wood (Column 4, lines 58-60 and 63-64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have constructed the stickings and the stile rail cores from different wood materials taught by Hagemeyer in order to provide a sticking that has more strength and rigidity in order to properly restrain and secure the panels of the veneered wooden door of Gartland.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan D. Kwiecinski whose telephone number is (571)272-5160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Chilcot can be reached on (571)272-6777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


RDK

Robert Canfield
Primary Examiner

